DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 416 540 CS 509 736

AUTHOR Brown, Jim; Leipzig, John; McWherter, Pamela
TITLE The SCA Speaking Competencies: Developing a Practical, Course-Embedded Assessment with a Reflexive Loop for Active Student Learning.
PUB DATE 1997-11-00
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (83rd, Chicago, IL, November 19-23, 1997).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Communication Skills; Evaluation Methods; Higher Education; *Instructional Effectiveness; *Introductory Courses; Outcome Based Education; *Public Speaking; *Student Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS *Communication Competencies; Speech Communication Association; *University of Alaska Fairbanks

ABSTRACT

The Communication Department at the University of Alaska Fairbanks (UAF) turned to the Speech Communication Association (SCA) for guidance in responding to a mandate for ongoing outcome assessment issued by the Alaska State Regents for Higher Education. Faculty involved in the baccalaureate CORE Communication service courses at UAF turned to the Competent Speaker: Speech Evaluation Form (CSSE) for qualitative and quantitative data for evaluation of student presentations. A diverse student body includes a significant percentage of Native students and a high population of non-traditional and returning students. Even for some Communication professionals, the eight Public Speaking Competencies seem abstract and distant from their lived experience of student-speaking in the classroom. The competencies are clear, but abstract in regard to providing observable standards for use in the classroom. A significant consideration in turning the SCA Competencies into specific, observable behavior specifications is the matter of training. The faculty restructured the Competencies for local use and trained themselves, three rural adjuncts, and nine graduate teaching assistants responsible for teaching the basic course in how to use the restructured SCA materials. On a trial basis, students were trained in observation and rating of peer presentations. At this point of development, UAF faculty have gathered data on every presentation of every student in the basic course for 1996-97 academic year. Results indicated that student speaking competency increased incrementally over the semester. Ongoing development includes embedding "The Competent Group Communicator" in their public speaking/small group hybrid service course. (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 416 540

Running head: THE SCA SPEAKING COMPETENCIES

The SCA speaking competencies: Developing a practical, course-embedded assessment with a reflexive loop for active student learning

Jin Brown, John Leipzig, and Pamela McWherter

University of Alaska Fairbanks

Department of Communication

Paper Prepared for the Speech Communication Association 83rd Annual Convention

Chicago, IL

November 19-23, 1997

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
J. Leipzig
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

CS509736

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The SCA Speaking Competencies: Developing a Practical, Course-Embedded Assessment with a Reflexive Loop for Active Student Learning

The distant drums of outcome assessment have finally reached the end of their east-to-west progression. Like many, if not most, universities in the "lower 48" the mandate has reached Alaska in the form of a directive for ongoing outcome assessment issued by the Alaska State Regents for Higher Education. While many departments in the University, particularly those with no need for accreditation processes, are literally scrambling to understand what is called for so they can invent an assessment program, the Communication Department at the University of Alaska Fairbanks (UAF), as other Communication departments at other schools, has turned to its national organization, the Speech Communication Association (SCA), for guidance. The practical necessity of a Regent mandated education effectiveness evaluation (an outcome assessment) has led faculty involved in the baccalaureate CORE Communication service courses at UAF to an innovative adaptation of the SCA Public Speaking Competencies (CSSE) which provides, as the documentation of the instrument suggests, qualitative and quantitative data for evaluation of student presentations. In the process of embedding the CSSE in the CORE courses for collection of student progress data we have also created an active learning loop in student participation which other, similarly situated departments, may find very useful.

The Speech Communication Association has been at the forefront of the outcomes assessment movement since the mid-1970s. The call from colleges and universities was to provide components in the general education core designed to

ensure competence in oral communication skills. The SCA Standards for Effective Oral Communication Programs followed in 1979; the Criteria for Evaluating Instruments and Procedures for Assessing Speaking and Listening in 1986; and the SCA Wingspread Conference of 1987 focused on a direct connection between "content of oral communication and student speaking competencies." At the National Conference on Assessment, in July of 1990, the SCA Committee on Assessment and Testing penned the current perspective of the discipline on assessment of speaking competencies. The results of that document are thorough in regard to the general criteria of assessment, criteria for the content of assessment, criteria for assessment instruments, criteria for assessment procedures and administration, and criteria for the use of assessment results. Those criteria have guided the development of the assessment instrument (Morreale, S. P., Moore, M. R., Taylor, K. P., Sturges-Tatum, D., and Hulbert-Johnson, R., 1993) distributed as an SCA publication in Education and Instructional Development. The document, The Competent Speaker: Speech Evaluation Form (CSSE), provides guidelines for training users of the instrument as well as specifying uses of the instrument. While considerable work has been invested in the development and testing of the instrument, the language of the Competencies remains abstract and somewhat vague to use in achieving consistency across raters of public speaking assignments. In its published form, although it has been tested in use by faculty, adjunct faculty, and some students, it seems best suited for use by experienced Communication professionals.

Program History

The University of Alaska Fairbanks provides education to a unique student population. The student body is extraordinarily diverse, including a significant

percentage of Native students and a high population of Non-Traditional and Returning students. In 1993, a newly appointed and active Provost offered the University faculty information that he had gathered from government and corporate employers of UAF graduates. UAF graduates, it was said, were being hired into entry-level positions, but were slow to move up in their organizations because they lacked the skills of working competently together with others in group situations. At that time, the Communication service courses at UAF were public speaking courses and small group/speaking course hybrids taught by both faculty and instructors. Each faculty member and instructor, while working with a specified set of core concepts, had the option to choose the books from which to teach their sections of the course and to prepare syllabi and instruction plans that focused on their own perception of what was significant for their students to learn. Outcomes were assessed by grades, in terms of Student Opinion surveys, and through anecdotal information.

In a strategic move in 1994 the Department put forth a plan to the University and Regents very much in line with the "more for less" requirement of contemporary Higher Education. The Department proposed a move that would eliminate its three instructor positions, convert those positions to eight Graduate Teaching Assistantships, and offer a graduate degree in Communication all within its present budget. The proposed change would also make it possible to meet 100% of the University's demand for the Communication service courses whereas the instructor structure covered barely 70% of demand. At the same time that the proposal was being unanimously approved, faculty were in the process of renovating the basic course in a way that would standardize the material presented, more fully address issues of diversity, and structure group interaction to prepare our students

for the contemporary workplace into which we send them (see Appendix A, Statement of purpose from Communication 131X, Fundamentals of Oral Communication: Group Context).

The first group of GTAs arrived in the Fall semester of 1995 and began teaching our CORE service courses while taking the required graduate course in "Teaching College Communication." "Fine-tuning" the service courses, mentoring Teaching Assistants, and acquainting the University with the Departmental changes occupied the Fall semester. The Spring semester was spent again adjusting to the time constraints of adding a graduate program, involving GTAs in assessing whether the service courses were accomplishing what we intended, and evaluating for ourselves the effects on our undergraduate major of adding the graduate component of our program. During the final part of the Spring semester we were given our next koan. The Alaska Regents for Higher Education, like many before them in the "lower 48," sent out a system-wide mandate requiring all aspects of Alaska Higher Education to plan and execute an ongoing process of outcome assessment.

While others in the system met this call with the reluctance of having "been here before" many times, our Department saw the potential for an organized and consistent, ongoing assessment of the changes we were making both in the service courses and in the undergraduate major. When the University called for assessment pilot programs, we volunteered our service courses, both because we knew that our national organization had done considerable ground-breaking work for us and because we wanted to know more securely what the changes we had initiated were accomplishing. Information that could be used to address the matter of accountability implied by the Regents' mandate would also substantiate the value of changes made in the basic course. We turned to the SCA for direction and began

our own education on the Competent Speaker instrumentation.

It was clear that the use of the SCA Competency instrument would serve us well. We wanted to demonstrate that the course improved the skills of organization and presentation that we intended to teach. We also wanted to create a continuous means of data collection as a vehicle for course improvement. Using the CSSE in our courses gave us a consistent means of evaluating student progress, a way of embedding data collection in actual course work, and continuous data to measure variables within the structure of the courses.

Preparation for embedding the SCA evaluation in the CORE service courses began with Department faculty teaching several sections of those courses in the summer session prior to again giving the teaching of the courses over to Graduate Teaching Assistants in the Fall of 1996. The SCA competencies and the SCA rating form were used by faculty in presenting those summer sections. We found that the competencies, specifically their language, were awkward to use as pedagogical materials. As experienced professors of public speaking and small group communication, we found using the CSSE was a good move toward consistency in the evaluation of student speaking. The validity and reliability of the instrument had been secured (see Morreale, et al., 1993) by extensive testing and use. Students, however, found the language of the competencies vague and confusing when they tried to use the competencies as preparation guidelines. There was more difficulty expressed by students in understanding the discrimination of evaluation levels in the SCA three-level scoring instrument.

The SCA Competencies

Even for some Communication professionals, the Eight Public Speaking Competencies seem abstract and distant from their lived experience of student

speaking in the college classroom. The competencies are clear, but abstract in regard to providing observable standards for use in actual settings of evaluation. Further, even if the evaluating professional can attend both the language of the SCA competencies and the live student presentation, making evaluative judgements while in the process of student presentations, using the SCA rater's form can be awkward and/or problematic. In addition, there is the problem of using the SCA competencies in giving students feedback for improvement in a way that makes the language of the competencies viable as a teaching tool. For faculty in the present case, there remained the final problem of maintaining the overall consistency in the teaching of the CORE service courses, particularly in regard to evaluation of student presentations in a program where the majority of the CORE service classes are taught by mentored Graduate Teaching Assistants and the students represent such a great range of diversity.

The common question, brought to faculty by teaching assistants, some of whom were not undergraduate Communication majors, was "how does one differentiate between 'unsatisfactory,' 'satisfactory,' and 'excellent' ratings in regard to the SCA competencies." Our answer was to suggest that they think of the levels of rating spatially. That is, to conceive "unsatisfactory" as a space one inch wide; "satisfactory" as a space two inches wide; and "excellent" as a space one quarter inch wide. The advice located the raters in regard to our experience at teaching public speaking, put in place a conscious overview of their thinking about the process, and lowered the potential of over- and under-rating by the GTA evaluators. The rating form, however, became the first focus of the process of changing the SCA Public Speaking Competencies into observable behavioral descriptions (what the SCA discussion of evaluation forms calls "molecular/specific

behaviors") that could be taught to Graduate Teaching Assistants for use in evaluating student presentations and which could produce the inter-rater reliability the Department felt necessary in offering the University-wide required courses.

Having experienced both student and Graduate Teaching Assistant frustrations with the SCA evaluation instrument, it was clear that the rating form itself would be one necessary focus. The SCA form does not carry a complete descriptor of the expectation of each specific competency. It uses the competency number in each of eight boxes along with a brief outline statement of that competency (e. g. "provides supporting material appropriate to the audience and occasion,") (SCA Competency Three). The difficulty with the rating form and with the competencies was summarized for Departmental faculty in the plaintive question from a student: "but what does it (specifically "appropriate language") look like?" While the student's question misses the mark, the difficulty is made recognizable. In order to "see" the language of the competencies in a student presentation, an observer must have a functional comprehension of the language or significant years of experience at public speaking pedagogy. In that incoming Graduate Teaching Assistants seldom are so equipped, it was clear that for any coordinated use of the SCA material the competencies must be made "visible" by locating them in just the sort of "molecular/specific behaviors" implied by the SCA.

"Visible" is made noticeable here specifically to draw attention to the assumption of the metaphor of sight. To "see" or to "observe" must be understood to specifically be a metaphorical use of vision. Just as human beings can "see" a greeting as such, even across cultural boundaries in most cases, observation of speaking events for the purpose of evaluation is a matter of expectations. Such observation is always a social construction and training, both of speakers and

evaluators, functions to establish such expectations.

Molecular Specific Behaviors

A significant consideration in turning the SCA Competencies into molecular/ specific, observable behavior specifications is the matter of training. Any use of the competencies requires training, yet for novice users of a rating form training in the use of the form is particularly important. In restructuring the Competencies for our local use we constantly considered the manner in which users of the form would be trained.

In attaching the SCA competencies to observable behavior, it was found that some of the strengths of the SCA instrument were enhanced. Giving observable behavioral coordinates to verbal and nonverbal competencies, for instance, quickly improved rater skills and allowed our efforts to focus on addressing the attachment of behavioral descriptions to more difficult aspects of speaking evaluation (e. g. "remote" preparation). A significant problem with the SCA document's training procedure was overcome. Where the training instruction suggests that raters "familiarize" themselves "with the criteria for evaluating unsatisfactory, satisfactory, and excellent levels of performance within each of those eight competencies," we all found the instruction to be rather optimistic, particularly for new raters. Making the language of the competencies amenable to observable behaviors, giving raters behaviors to "look" for, made a necessary connection between the competencies and the lived process of classroom evaluation of student presentations.

Competency One in the SCA instrument, for instance, requires a rater to make decisions over the course of an entire presentation and, therefore, cannot be rated at the beginning of the presentation. The rater must be trained to withhold judgement on this competency until the end of the presentation. This competency

for this competency, can only be assessed after accumulating some specifics of audience analysis in other competencies (e. g. "appropriate language"). Competency One asks the rater to assess whether the speaker "presents a topic and a focus" that are "exceptionally appropriate," "appropriate," or "not appropriate" for "the purpose, time constraints, and audience." The instrument claims to measure nothing but behavior, yet the descriptor here does not specify any appropriate behaviors upon which a rater may focus in evaluating. The "time constraint" is the only observable that a rater might use as criteria. Time limits are either met or not. Refocusing the rater's attention from the abstract to the observable here is not entirely possible in that distinct behaviors do not exist. In the spirit of the competency, however, raters can be trained to look for "evidence of" the speaker accomplishing what the competency addresses. We chose to use "evidence of preparation" as a descriptor of the observableness of research, organizing to a time requirement, consideration of the given audience, and outlining/note card preparation.

Clearly no distinct behavior incorporates such matters, but "evidence" of these matters are observable as local practices necessary for successful presentations, and success, as a quality of the presentation, can be addressed by any competent observer. "Evidence of practice" is a similar matter we have chosen for Competency One. Again, a competent observer (even if that observer is not a competent speaker) can discern in most cases if the speaker has practiced the presentation. Our Guidelines, then, ask the rater to observe three matters in order to rate this competency:

Evidence of preparation,

Evidence of practice, and

Within the specified time.

Competency Two in the SCA guidelines calls for the speaker to "[communicate] the thesis/specific purpose in a manner appropriate for the audience and occasion." In that "occasion" in most basic courses means a classroom of peers in a Communication course, it must be facilitated in a way that the student understands the variability of social occasions for speaking in public. For the purpose of the classroom, the audience is generally "set" for a semester, assuring that audience demographics remain constant for speaking preparations. Where the SCA rating form calls for "thesis/specific purpose" we have taken the liberty to use this competency for observation of the introduction. We felt that to leave both the introduction and conclusion together in the same competency would overload Competency Four both in regard to what must be observed and in terms of how much is evaluated. We specify for observation in Competency Two:

Attention gaining material,

Thesis/specific purpose,

Relevance material,

Central Idea, and

Transition into body.

Not only are these matters of good speaking that are regularly taught as specific points in our courses, they are clearly observable in presentational forms of both informative and persuasive speaking.

SCA Competency Three regards whether the speaker "provides supporting material appropriate to the audience and occasion." Our guideline calls for evaluators to observe for:

Good evidence,

Main points clear and elaborated,

Quality and Relevance of evidence, and

Smoothness in the introduction of evidence.

Competency Four no longer addresses the introduction in our guideline. We ask raters to observe for:

Internal transitions,

Transition from body to conclusion,

Summary of points (arguments), and

Definitive final statement.

Again we chose to separate the introduction and conclusion for rating purposes. Our restructured rating form allows for differences as the speaker moves from informative to persuasive modes and directs attention to common novice errors, such as cohesiveness of the presentation and tentativeness in concluding the presentation.

Competency Five, "uses language appropriate to audience and occasion," we teach in regard to some specific local needs. Whether it is our location as "the last frontier," or the level of education of families from which a large percentage of our student population is drawn, we have, according to anecdotal evidence from significant time in the classroom here and other places by comparison, a considerable problem educating students about bias-free language. Students here seem extraordinarily reluctant to accept teaching that requires self-examination in regard to language in specific and diversity issues in general. We must often address student's defense mechanisms built on the conservative use of the term "politically correct" as a common language pejorative. We find that describing any courteousness in regard to cultural others in our communication practices is labeled

"political correctness" by many students and dismissed outright. Particularly many of our male students here on the last frontier object, resonant with superficial "sound-bite" dismissals in the national media, to any tolerence of sexual orientation, feminist perspectives, or any perspectives culturally different from their own. "Appropriate language" therefore becomes an entry point for the teaching of critical thinking and for teaching recognition of the rights of others in the language we each use. We conceive this competency in the following descriptors:

Bias-free language,

Formal language level (free of slang and/or specialized use), and

No reflexivity (speaker draws NO attention to self-as speaker).

The reflexivity matter comes from the attempt to train novice speakers to avoid such constructs as "Today I am going to speak about...," and "In conclusion...," which detract from the information of the presentation itself. In using the guidelines for the competencies, we train evaluators to observe for informal usage ("you" rather than "one") and everyday language (such as "stuff like that") in this competency.

Competency Six, being more clearly behavior specific than other of the SCA formulations, is accepted almost verbatim. We train raters to hear slower presentation as "locally appropriate" for credibility even though rate is considered differently in other locations. Intensity is associated with projection and labeled "volume," in that the concept of volume is a commonplace usage in a media society. And expressiveness is associated with pitch. Rate, pitch and volume are all taught as "vocal variety." The observational constructs are:

Rate,

Expressiveness/pitch, and

Intensity/volume.

Competency Seven we conceive very similarly to the SCA document. Pronunciation, particularly of key words and phrases, is carefully stressed in terms of speaker credibility. Our use of this competency makes significant as "articulation" the matter of the differences between the sound and rhythm of speaking and that of reading. The novice practice of reading from notecards is strongly discouraged. This competency also gives our raters the opportunity to note negatively the matter of speaking "fillers." Often novice speakers (and even experienced speakers) fail to "hear" themselves using fillers ("um...," "uh...," "errr...," etc.) as if to maintain their turn in conversation. Our raters observe the following to rate this competency:

Grammar,

Articulation (clarity, rhythm),

Delivery (not halting or choppy),

No fillers ("um...," "errr...," etc.),

NO READING !!!!!

Finally, Competency Eight addresses nonverbal aspects of presentation and the rating form runs very parallel to the SCA Competency. We stress eye contact as key to credibility and teach speaking to the entire audience. This competency makes the use of notecards evident for evaluation. It addresses lectern use. And it allows for instruction on the connection of appropriateness of speaker's dress and audience evaluation. The descriptors are:

Eye contact with the audience,

Good use of note cards (not held),

No complete sentences on cards (except direct quotations),

Lectern use, and

Appearance (no hats, caps, sweats, etc.).

As is apparent, the construction of evaluation practices and expectations follow from local faculty perceptions of teaching speaking to a local population of students. The reconstruction of the SCA Competencies, however, does not alter their overall conception and maintains the integrity of the intention of each Competency, attaching molecular/specific behaviors as conceived in regard to a given student population. Such use of the SCA Competencies is directed by the organized and consistent training of raters in observations of the competencies as outlined in the Guidelines we have developed (see Appendix B).

A final change we have instigated is to alter the rater form itself in one significant way. Rather than the form as presented by the SCA, the altered form offers an abbreviated listing of the molecular/specific behaviors as we have specified them for teaching and rating. A single box is provided for the rater in which she or he enters the number (1, 2, or 3) that designates the speaking event for the particular competency as "unsatisfactory," "satisfactory," or "excellent," (see Appendix C).

The changes briefly outlined in this section have made it possible to use the standards of the national organization as a key component in the teaching and assessment of our basic course. Embedding the use of the competencies and competency rating in the CORE service courses assures that, while using primarily Graduate Teaching Assistants mentored in the presentation of the courses, we maintain a level of consistency in the teaching of speaking skills and the evaluation of those skills.

At the end of this phase of reworking the course for instruction and consistent evaluation by Graduate Assistants, we had created a set of observational Guidelines

for our local use of the SCA Competencies (appendix B). By recreating the rating form in a way that specified the molecular/behavioral observations beside the competency numbers, we were able to create a vehicle that made both evaluation consistencies and inter-rater reliability manageable and, we hoped, easily trained.

At that point, at the end of summer session 1996, we invited adjunct faculty from UAF rural campuses to participate in a workshop both to update them in regard to changes in the way the course was reconceptualized and to see if our evaluation by SCA Competencies could be taught for use in the extended UAF system. Adjuncts from Nome, Bristol Bay, and Tok attended the workshop and with very little difficulty were brought within the acceptable range of inter-rater reliability using, as suggested by the SCA, videotapes of students from our UAF summer sections. When the GTAs returned for their early week of retraining, they too came rapidly on line with the skills of using the SCACompetencies and reliably evaluating student presentations. As the Fall semester of 1996 began, we had restructured the SCA materials for our own use in our basic courses, reliably trained four faculty, three rural adjuncts, eight GTAs in our campus program, and a ninth GTA who was responsible for instruction in the basic course in our affiliated Community College (Tanana Valley Community College).

Student rating as pedagogy

At some point in the process of development, we ask ourselves, even considering the "cautions" suggested about use of the evaluation forms by the SCA documentation, could not evaluation specifics and use of our rating form be taught to the students themselves. In testing the reliability of the Competencies across perceptions of cultural diversity, the developers successfully used a sampling of minority students to rate presentations (Morreales, et al., p. 33). We had found in

the summer that by making the competencies more clearly observable, students appeared to have become more involved in peer evaluation. Observing and listening to peer presentations and having a means of saying directly where improvement is necessary or where the peer has done well seemed to operate to involve the speaker in active learning. In this case, the student is taking an active role in mastering and communicating course content, and the course content, because our assignments require students to speak on topics about communication (see, for example, Appendix D), engages a unique reflexive loop in student learning. We believe that training students in observation and rating of peer presentations increases their active learning in a way that enhances their own public speaking skills.

Anecdotally, the faculty who used the competencies in the summer sessions agreed that for learning the process of public speaking, having students think about the process in the terms of evaluation with the SCA Competencies appeared to enhance the students' own incorporation of concepts into their learning of organization and presentation skills. Students, that is, seemed to reflexively and actively move the recognition of criteria in the evaluation of peers into their own preparation and presentation process. When students observed the process in a way that called for them to evaluate others by observable criteria, those criteria seemed to be actively incorporated into the student's own anticipation, planning, and presenting. Faculty felt that more information was necessary before permanently involving all students in our basic courses in rater training, but the practice was incorporated into plans for the Fall of 1996.

During Fall semester, 1996, the restructured course received its "trial run," in all sixteen sections of the basic course (25 student limit per section). GTAs, as standard practice in the program, have a different faculty mentor each semester and

meet with the mentor weekly as a group. The practice has been that every other meeting GTAs and some faculty go through the SCA suggested training procedures in using the Competencies to retain their level of inter-rater reliability. Potential interpersonal biases between GTAs and their students (both positive and negative) are thus minimized for evaluation purposes.

Current Status of the Development

At this point of the development of our embedded assessment of student outcomes, we have collected information on every presentation of every student enrolled in our basic courses for the Fall semester of 1996 and Spring of 1997 (roughly 23 students x 16 sections). Quantitative data were recorded, that is, for every student on each competency and over every presentation. In addition, each student in six sections of the basic course were videotaped on the occasions of their first, third and final (fifth) presentation to provide qualitative data for evaluation. For outcomes assessment of the course, these processes for data collection will continue each semester into the future of the program. Results will be used, as it already has, to improve the course for UAF students.

Most significantly, in terms of the Regent's mandate for accountability, we have found that the courses can clearly be shown to improve student speaking competency incrementally over a semester of instruction. Collected data were used to consider which competencies account for the greatest improvement and which competencies might require further elaboration for instructional purposes. It was of interest to find that symposium presentations, rated currently as speaking events using the competencies, continue a linear improvement trend for students in speaking evaluations. Individual presentations within symposia, that is, appear to be observable as events in themselves by trained raters.

Video data collected as qualitative support for instructional program assessment will also be used to consider the effects of taping on the success of its use in instruction. Videotapes so collected will continue to be used for further training of raters as well as to chronicle student improvement.

The basic course team of faculty and GTAs are currently discussing the value of training students enrolled in the service courses as raters, using the competencies and the locally developed behavioral descriptions that make the competencies recognizable for observation. At this point of discussion, there is a general feeling that training has a positive effect on student learning and is useful to the demonstration of learning in the basic course. Under discussion is whether the semester's planned course work leaves enough room for formal training of all students in the use of the competencies and rating form as well as the upcoming SCA group communication scale.

On-going Development

The UAF Department of Communication faculty believe that the present experience with assessment has produced interesting results both for assessment and pedagogy. The demonstration that the SCA Competencies can be used in settings of extraordinary cultural diversity has been one very useful finding here. We have seen that the evaluation standards of the national organization can be embedded in course work so that evaluation may proceed on an on-going basis without disrupting class progress or requiring excess instruction time. Records of the data are simple to collect (see Appendix F, data record). The experience of this department has been that having an evaluation plan for a significant aspect of its CORE service course has been positively received by the University, particularly in comparison to disciplines and departments who have no such preparation in place. The data

collected have, in trial runs, encouraged the present structure of the CORE classes and reinforced our anticipated perspective of student learning in the courses.

Over the Summer sessions of 1998, faculty anticipate the beginning process of embedding The Competent Group Communicator, (Beebe, S. A., Barge, J. K., and McCormick, C. M., as presented at the 1996 SCAconvention in San Diego), in our public speaking/small group hybrid service course. We have been using a form of Bales analysis but feel that the Competent Group Communicator has potential for our course.

REFERENCES

Morreale, S. P., Moore, M. R., Taylor, K. P., Sturges-Tatum, D., & Hulbert-Johnson, R. (Eds.) (1993). The competent speaker: Speech evaluation form. Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

Beebe, S. A., Barge, J. K., & McCormick, C. M. (1996, November). Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, San Diego, CA.